

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 12 and 13 have been amended herein. Claims 4 and 12 have been amended to be in independent form and include substantially the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Support for the amendment to Claims 1 and 10 can be found at least in Figures 3 and 4 of the present application. Support for the amendment to Claim 6 can be found at least in Figure 5 and paragraph [0023] of the present application. Claims 16-18 have been cancelled herein. No new matter has been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant's representative has amended paragraphs [0001] and [0018] of the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1 and 6 stand objected to for certain informalities. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended herein to recite "running a cable through an opening." It is believed that with these amendments to Claims 1 and 6, the objections are rendered moot. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to Claims 1 and 6 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 stands objected to for certain informalities. Claim 4 has been amended herein to be in independent form. It is believed that with the amendment to Claim 4, the

objection to Claim 4 is now moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to Claim 4 is requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10-12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 10 and 12 have been amended herein. It is believed that with the amendments to Claims 10 and 12, the rejection of Claims 10-12 and 15 is now rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Everitt (U.S. Pat. No. 5,596,176) in view of Araki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,564,617), Igura et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,703,279), Matlock et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 2,694,924) and Kops (U.S. Pat. No. 4,002,055). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Referring to Claim 1, the claim calls for “inserting an integral single piece guide member through an opening in a fuselage of an aircraft” and “forming a first seal between said guide member and said opening.” Similarly, Claim 10 calls for “inserting an integral single piece guide member having an opening therein through an opening in a fuselage of an aircraft” and “forming a first seal between said guide member and said opening.” It is respectfully submitted that the prior art of record does not disclose, suggest nor teach the subject matter of Claims 1 and 10.

In the Office Action, the Everitt reference is relied upon as teaching a gland housing member 10 through which a wire 61 can be passed. Additionally, the Office Action relies upon the Everitt reference as teaching the use of a bypass tube 22 that

can be positioned within the gland housing member 10 and through which additional wires can be passed. The gland housing member 10 taught in the Everitt reference, however, is significantly more complex and is not even remotely similar to an integral single piece guide member as called for in Claims 1 and 10. Rather, the gland housing member 10 is composed of multiple components such as a housing 11 that is sealed to one side of a bulkhead opening with an O-ring 21 and a nut 20, a cable sealing membrane 12, a pair of insulators 15 and 17 between which a silicone rubber sealing compound is inserted. See at least column 1, line 63 - column 2, line 38 of the Everitt reference. Thus, the gland housing member 10 is significantly more complex and more costly than the integral single piece guide member called for in Claims 1 and 10. It is respectfully submitted that the gland housing member 10 is so different and complex that one skilled in the art seeking to develop a simple guide member for use in running a cable from the interior of the aircraft to the exterior of the aircraft through an opening in the fuselage would not look to the teachings of the Everitt et al. reference to arrive at an integral single piece guide member as called for in Claims 1 and 10. Thus, for at least this reason it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 10 are nonobvious and patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 2, 3, 5, 11 and 13-15 all depend from one of Claims 1 and 10 and, therefore, for at least the reasons stated above with reference to Claims 1 and 10 are also nonobvious and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

Referring now to Claim 6, the claim calls for "running a cable through an opening in a fuselage of an aircraft" and "forming a seal between said cable and said opening by applying a sealant directly to said cable and said opening." It is respectfully submitted

that the subject matter of Claim 6 is nonobvious and patentable over the prior art of record.

In the Office Action, the Everitt reference is relied upon as disclosing a gland housing member 10 through which a wire 61 is passed. The wire 61, however, is sealed to gland housing member 10 through the use of a cable sealing membrane 12 and a silicone rubber sealing compound or the like introduced into chamber 13. The housing 11 of cable sealing gland 10 is sealingly secured within an orifice cut in a bulkhead panel through the use of an O-ring seal 21 and a jam nut 20. See at least column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 27 of the Everitt reference. Thus, the Everitt reference teaches the use of housing member 10 that is sealingly secured to an opening in a bulkhead panel and the running of a cable through multiple sealing elements within the gland housing member 10. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Everitt reference does not disclose, teach nor suggest the forming of a seal between a cable and an opening in a fuselage by applying a sealant directly to the cable and the opening as called for in Claim 6. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 6 is nonobvious and patentable over the prior art of record. Claim 7-9 all depend from Claim 6 and, therefore, for at least the reason stated above with reference to Claim 6 are also nonobvious and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 4 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant's representative has amended Claims 4 and 12

to substantially include the subject matter of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, Claims 4 and 12 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant's representative therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 12, 2004

By: 
Jeffrey H. Urian, Reg. No. 46,232

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/JHU/ps